

Appl. No. 10/003,776  
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P14206US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3170

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

#### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-5 and 7. The source for the amendments is found on page 6, last paragraph beginning with "The shared secret...". Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### **Examiner Objections – Specification**

The abstract was objected to because the text "Figure 1" should be omitted. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of the specification. In response, the Applicant has modified the abstract as suggested by the Examiner. Attached on a separate sheet is a clean abstract.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1 and 3 - 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mamros, et al. US 6,360,269 (hereinafter Mamros). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim.

The Mamros reference appears to disclose a protected "keepalive" message that is transmitted by a local computer to a remote computer for keeping the connection between the computers alive when the communications link between the remote and local computers has been idle. Mamros discloses a protected ISAKMP/Oakley command sent to the remote computer and the local computer must receive a protected acknowledgment so that the local computer does not terminate the communications link.

The Applicant's invention discloses a method and apparatus for encrypting VOIP transmissions. The invention uses IKE Phase 1 negotiations to establish an IKE security association (SA) between the first and second nodes. Then IKE Phase 2 negotiations are used to negotiate an IPSec SA for each transmission direction. Since

Appl. No. 10/003,776  
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P14206US1  
EUS/JIP/05-3170

the VOIP transmissions are not subjected to a complete IPSec procedure, only the IKE component is used and the resulting packets do not include IPSec headers.

The Mamros reference does not disclose using IKE phase 1 or IKE phase 2 negotiations. Nor does Mamros disclose using only the IKE component to negotiate a IPSec SA data relevant to the encryption. (page 6, last paragraph) Further, Mamros does not disclose sending a datagram without IPSec headers.

Claims 3-4 depend from amended independent claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, claims 3-4 contain the novel limitations of claim 1. Amended independent claim 5 is analogous to and contains limitations similar to the novel limitations of amended independent claim 1. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 5 and contain the same novel limitations. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-7.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The language objected to in claims 3 and 4 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)**

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mamros et al US 6,360,269 (hereinafter Mamros) in view of Rao, et al. US 6,757,823 (hereinafter Rao). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim.

The Rao reference appears to disclose a method for providing secure signaling connections for packet data network telephony calls (VOIP) using H.323 protocol.

Though Rao appears to provide secure signaling connections for VOIP, Rao does not supply the missing elements of Phase 1 and Phase 2 negotiation between nodes, using only the IKE component and sending a datagram containing the VOIP payload without IPSec headers. Claim 2 depends from amended Independent claim 1

Appl. No. 10/003,776  
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P14206US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3170

and contains the same novel limitations. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2.


Appl. No. 10/003,776  
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005  
Reply to Office action of April 29, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. P14206US1  
EUS/J/P/05-3170

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Date: July 28, 2005

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com